

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

STEVEN MATTHEW ARMSTRONG,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TYLER SMITH, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:24-cv-00575-GMN-BNW

**ORDER ADOPTING  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), (ECF No. 13), from United States Magistrate Judge Brenda N. Weksler recommending that two of Plaintiff’s claims be dismissed. (*See generally* R&R, ECF No. 13).

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions to which objections are made if the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations concern matters that may not be finally determined by a magistrate judge. D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s R&R where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

No objections to the R&R were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. (*See generally* R&R) (setting an April 17, 2025, deadline for objections).

1 Accordingly,

2 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 13), is  
3 **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED** in full.

4 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment claim based on the  
5 illegal arrest in Case No. C-23-378525 against Detective Chapman is **DISMISSED** without  
6 leave to amend.

7 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Sixth Amendment claim based on unfair  
8 jury selection against District Attorneys Afshar and Jaramillo is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

9 Dated this 30 day of April, 2025.

10  
11   
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge  
14 United States District Court  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25